

REMARKS

In the office action mailed July 23, 2007, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of the Templeton et al reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,679,938), the Laage reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,931,382) the Houvener et al reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,464) or some combination thereof. By this paper, the Applicant has amended the claims of the application to highlight the subject matter the Applicant believes is allowable over the art of record. Hence, reconsideration of the above-captioned application in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein is now respectfully requested.

After carefully reviewing Templeton, Laage and Houvener, the Applicant notes that none of these references, either by themselves or in combination with each other disclose the concept of a system that has a point-of-sale device that includes a plurality of stored receipt formats, including providing no receipt, wherein the point-of-sale device selects a receipt format from the plurality of stored receipt formats which includes selecting no receipt for accounts receivable-type checks (*See, e.g.*, Claim 1 as amended). As noted in the application as filed, the system has the ability to store different receipt formats for different types of transactions and then print a customized receipt (*See, e.g.* paragraphs 168 *et seq.*). This includes the ability of the point-of-sale device to select no receipt when a accounts receivable transaction is detected.

In contrast, none of the cited references disclose anything about stored receipt formats including a no receipt format. The only discussion in Templeton about receipts involves very limited discussion that the device can be configured to be used with receipt printers. There is no disclosure of how the receipt formats are to be determined or, indeed, even if there is to be more than one possible format. There is further no discussion in Templeton of determining, on a case by case basis, of whether the transaction requires a receipt or not or determining what type of receipt is appropriate.

Similarly, Laage is equally silent as to the concept of selecting appropriate receipt formats from a plurality of stored formats. The Applicant further argues that the Examiner's characterization of Laage as teaching the concept of blocking printing of receipts is incorrect. Laage does not talk about the printing or not printing of receipts. Rather Laage discloses the general concept of blocking the use of payment instruments, e.g., credit cards, to users through an encryption scheme. Absent a showing of any applicability of Laage to printers, the Applicant

submits that the original combination of Templeton and Laage made by the Examiner in the previous office action still fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the previously presented claims. Further, there is certainly no combination of these two references that disclose the concept of having stored receipt formats and selecting an appropriate receipt format there from which can include no receipt in the manner claimed by the Applicant.

Lastly, Houvener is similarly silent with respect to the printing or non-printing of receipts in different receipt formats. Thus, even if it was obvious to combine the references in the manner outlined by the Examiner, the combination of these references still fail to teach Claim 1 as amended. As such, the Applicant submits that Claim 1 as amended is allowable over the art of record.

The Applicant submits that independent Claims 6, 11, 19 and 25 define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. The Applicant further submits that Claims 2 – 5, 7 – 10, 12 – 18, 20 – 24, and 26 – 31 also define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable based upon their respective dependencies on Claims 1, 6, 11, 19 and 25.

The Applicant therefore believes the above-captioned application is in condition for allowance and requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to the prompt allowance of this application that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history

Application No.: 10/695,412
Filing Date: October 27, 2003

shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/21/07

By: 

Michael H. Trenholm
Registration No. 37,743
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(951) 781-9231

4562777:kma//112107